

DETAILED ACTION

This responds to the Office Communication mailed on 10/29/2009. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks. Further examination and reconsideration of the presently claimed application is respectfully requested.

Specification

The disclosure was objected to because of certain issues with reference numbers and acronyms on pages 3 and 4 of the specification. These issues have been corrected with the corresponding paragraphs 14 and 19.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to because of the term TRAU not being shown. Applicant has amended claim 15 to remove this term and replace it with the term BSC. Support for this amendment can be found at least in amended paragraph 14

[0014] The system 100 may include network elements that are able to perform various operations on voice and/or data communication rates carried within such systems. For example, the system 100 may utilize a network element such as a transcoder rate adaption unit (TRAU) (not shown) to handle the use of different codecs and rates. A TRAU may handle transcoding to convert information between two coding schemes, and may provide rate adaptation to handle the use of eight, sixteen, or thirty-two kbps rather than a higher rate such as sixty-four kbps so that networks or network elements using different rates can communicate. In the present example, although the TRAU may functionally belong the BTS 110, it may be located at the BTS 110, the BSC 112, or (immediately in front of) the MSC 120.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 9, 15, 20 and 21 were objected to. Applicant has amended these claims to overcome the objections.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-8, 13, 14 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC 112. Applicant has amended a majority of these claims to overcome the rejections. With respect to claims 7 and 13, Applicant respectfully believes the subject matter is different as the independent claims that these claims depend from include the limitation: “sending a substitute TFO acknowledgement message from the second network element to the first network element if ***no TFO acknowledgement message***

is identified from the third network element; establishing a TFO call leg between the first and second network elements and establishing a non-TFO call leg between the second and third network elements after sending the substitute TFO acknowledgement message from the second network element” whereas the dependent claims include the limitation: “establishing a non-TFO call if *no TFO request message* is identified.”

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants believe that the independent claims and the claims that depend from them are in condition for allowance and respectfully request they be passed to allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 01/29/2010

By: /Raffi Gostanian/

Raffi Gostanian

Reg. No. 42,595

972.849.1310